CONSORTIUM of SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

COSSA WASHINGTON UPDATE

Volume IV, Number 7
April 5, 1985

This Week . . .

* * *

LEGISLATIVE ROUTINES CONTINUE: NSF BILLS MARKED UP

As the rest of Washington awaits the momentous decisions on the budget that will emerge from negotiations among President Reagan, Senate Republicans and House Democrats, the routines of the legislative process continue. In the past two weeks a subcommittee and two full committees have marked up authorization bills for the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the Senate subcommittee that appropriates money for the agency held its hearings.

There were no major surprises in the bills reported by the House Science, Research and Technology Subcommittee, the full House Science and Technology Committee, or the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee. The total funding for NSF remains at the presidential request of $1.57 billion. The authorizations for social and behavioral sciences within the Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences Directorate still include the increases requested by the Foundation. The level for Science and Engineering Education (SE&E) was set at $82 million, with the assumption that $31.5 million would be carry-over money from FY 1985 (see below). All three restored funding for Ethics and Values in Science and Technology (EVIST) research, the House

SSA Washington Update is published 20-24 times per year, normally biweekly, by the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1200 Seventeenth Street, NW, Suite 520, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202/887-6166). Individual subscriptions are available from COSSA for $25.00; institutional subscriptions, $90.00; overseas airmail, $40.00. ISSN 0749-4394 COSSA Members, Affiliates, and Contributors are listed on the back.

Risa I. Palm, *President* David Jenness, *Executive Director*

at $1 million as previously, the Senate at $1.2 million. The House also restored some of the proposed cuts for Policy Research and Analysis (PRA); the Senate did not. The bills in both houses include the changes in the NSF organic act that would give engineering research equal status with science research in the mission and function of the Foundation. In another long sought change, the Assistant Directors of NSF would no longer be presidential appointees requiring Senate confirmation.

The hearings before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies, chaired by Astronaut-Senator Jake Garn (R-UT), were described by one Senator as "a love feast." Senator William Proxmire (D-WI) asked some sharp questions concerning the 4.4% increase in the face of calls for budget freezes, but there was generally strong support from Subcommittee members for the NSF budget. Budget Committee Chairman Pete Domenici (R-NM), whose committee froze the science function of the budget (which includes NSF and other science agencies), announced his "strong support for the increase" for NSF.

It now appears that the chances for overturning the deferral of $31.5 million in FY 1985 funds for Science and Engineering Education are getting slimmer as time passes. A consensus seems to be developing that it is getting too late in the fiscal year (which ends on September 30) for NSF to spend the deferred amount. However, there may be an attempt to overturn the deferral (which would require a majority vote in both Houses of Congress) during consideration of the first Supplemental Appropriations bill in May.

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS EXCELLENT TIME TO TALK TO MEMBERS AT HOME

Congress will be in recess from April 4 to April 15. Most Members will be back in their home districts and States talking to their constituents. This is an excellent time for social and behavioral scientists to make contact with Congresspeople to persuade them about the important research being done in our disciplines.

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: DOOMED TO BE HANDMAIDENS?

Science, in its March 29, 1985 issue, published an article about the new (September 1984) director of the National Science Foundation. The title of the story read, "A Forceful New Hand on the Reins at NSF." Reading the article, which included much interview material, social and behavioral scientists probably felt reined in, if not jerked about.

Bloch, who indeed is forceful and articulate, was reported as seeing these sciences as 'support functions,' and was quoted as saying: "Our main responsibility is to select the ones important to the physical sciences." While Bloch was also quoted

as saying, "we have an obligation towards those disciplines," he also added, "the Foundation can't be held responsible for doing everything."

In one respect, the Science report was clearly wrong; it quoted Bloch as endorsing research to "enhance their (i.e., those sciences') qualitative aspects"; the word 'quantitative' was clearly intended. The general tone, however, was disturbing and confusing. Confusing to those who know that the statutory language authorizing NSF directs it to "initiate and support basic scientific research and programs to strengthen scientific potential and science education programs at all levels in the mathematical, physical, biological, engineering, social, and other sciences...."

Disturbing to those who have heard Mr. Bloch repeatedly express, in his first months in office, the intention to support sound research in the social and behavioral sciences, and to maintain and improve university-based research -- where social and behavioral science, after all, represents a major investment.

Queried by Update, Mr. Bloch repeated this intention, pointing to a recent editorial he wrote that appeared in Science on March 1, 1985. In this piece, Bloch writes: "Finally, we are providing strong support for basic research, with emphasis on disciplines for which NSF has special responsibility because it is the major source of federal support. This category includes core mathematics, environmental biology, and social and economic sciences." (All these areas received substantial increases in the administration's proposed FY 1986 budget; social and economic science was given a 19 percent increase, the largest for any single NSF division.)

Bloch told Update that, if he used the term 'support' to the Science writer, he was referring to a linked scientific program in which the various branches of knowledge support -- i.e., connect up with -- each other. Saying again that "we can't support everything," he commented that, other things equal, research should be encouraged to cut across artificial disciplinary divisions in science, and, by linking up with scientific inquiry in other fields, to contribute potentially to economic and technological progress. Bloch has been candid, publicly and privately, on this world view; in his Science editorial, for example, he stated it as, "essentially that the nation faces tough economic competition and that our competitors are challenging our research pre-eminence in important fields." In the more recent Science interview, he is quoted as saying,"I say science is no more international than commerce is...I think it's a highly competitive field. I don't apologize for it."

In talking with Update, Bloch said that he hoped social and behavioral scientists would not be "thin-skinned." Update's judgment is that those scientists need not fear, from Bloch, being relegated to support functions. Whether it is thin-skinned to doubt whether NSF should support science ultimately for national competitive reasons is another question.

COSSA TESTIFIES ON NIE; CENTER COMPETITION DELAYED

On March 21, Dr. Paul Peterson, Director of the Governmental Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, testified on behalf of COSSA before the House Select Education Subcommittee on the reauthorization of the National Institute of Education (NIE). He advocated a strong federal role in education research and urged the Subcommittee to increase funding for individual investigator initiated awards at NIE. Testimony from other research groups reiterated these two major points. The Subcommittee hearings were held amidst rumors of changes in the federal government's role and structure in education research.

Fueling these rumors, Secretary of Education (ED) William Bennett this week suspended for two months the competition for 11 university-based research centers. The Secretary also appointed a committee to help him reconsider the research agendas for the centers. Members of the committee include, among others, Chester Finn of Vanderbilt University (still rumored to be the Assistant Secretary for Research in a restructured research and statistics function at ED), Diane Ravitch of Columbia University, Dennis Doyle of the American Enterprise Institute, and Robert Glaser, Director of the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. In the meantime, Bennett has named the current Director of the National Center for Education Statistics, Emerson Elliott, as Acting Director of NIE. Elliott has been Acting Director of NIE in the past and is generally respected in the education research community. (For earlier story see Update, March 8, 1985.)

NRC APPOINTS WORKING GROUPS FOR STUDY OF BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Since early in 1984, the Committee on Basic Research in the Behavioral and Social Sciences of the National Research Council has been organizing a prospective study, A TEN-YEAR OUTLOOK ON RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES IN THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES. (See Update, September 28, 1984.) The study is co-sponsored by the Social Science Research Council and the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

The study is now moving into a new phase, with the selection by the Committee of 30 topical working groups to investigate high-priority research areas in detail. Each working group will spend the next few months preparing a working paper intended to give the Committee a clear picture of the research objectives, practices, problems, and needs in each subject area. The Committee will receive the working groups' documents in mid-1985, and will then make recommendations for new scientific investments over the next decade that represent, in its judgment, "substantial promise of scientific and ultimately practical return." The Committee's co-chairpersons are Neil J. Smelser (sociology, Berkeley) and R. Duncan Luce (psychology, Harvard).

Although many of the working group titles have an identifiable disciplinary frame of reference, according to study director Dean R. Gerstein, the five to ten members of each group typically will include scholars from several disciplines. In fact, the working group members have been recruited by the chairpersons with a view toward building in that interdisciplinary balance.

The selection of topics was to a large degree driven by comment from the general social and behavioral science community. Over 600 persons responded to the Committee's call, for suggestions about the most promising areas of research and about researchers doing pathbreaking work. According to Luce, as the working groups dig deeper into their subject matters, further input from the field, addressed to these specific topics and to opportunities in and problems with them, can be of great importance. Comments and examples can be forwarded to the working group chairpersons directly or through study director Gerstein at the National Research Council, JH-853, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418. Brief descriptions of the constituent topics or lines of approach within each working group title are also available from the NRC office.

Asked whether the publicizing of the 30 working group titles did not essentially define the eventual priorities to be contained in the Committee's final report, not due until mid-1986, Smelser commented that this would be a misinterpretation. The Committee is free to select still other topics for detailed attention, or to combine or re-align subject matters. According to the Committee, the final report "will, to the extent possible, reflect a consensus of leaders and members of the behavioral and social science research community."

Listed below are the 30 working groups and their chairpersons.

Sensory and perceptual processes (Norma V. Graham, psychology, Columbia); Psychobiology of learning and memory (Richard F. Thompson, psychology, Stanford); Information and cognitive sciences (Saul Sternberg, human information-processing, AT&T Bell Laboratories); Language and Language Processing (Frederick J. Newmeyer, linguistics, Washington); Development of cognitive and social competence (Herbert L. Pick, psychology, Minnesota); Health and behavior (David S. Krantz, medical psychology, USUHS); Affect and motivation (Hans C. Fibiger, psychiatry, British Columbia); Social interaction (John F. Kihlstrom, psychology, Wisconsin-Madison); Gender studies (Nancy M. Henley, psychology, UCLA); Information and decisionmaking (Mark J. Machina, economics, California-San Diego); Market efficiency (Oliver E. Williamson, economics and law, Yale); Jobs and inequality (Frank P. Stafford, economics, Michigan); Markets and organizations (Stanley Reiter, economics, Northwestern); Collective choice institutions (William H. Riker, political science, Rochester); Emergence of social and political institutions (Douglass C. North, economics, Washington University); Urban transformation and migration (John M. Quigley,

public policy & economics, Berkeley); Causes and consequences of demographic change (Samuel Preston, population studies, Pennsylvania); Family and domestic relations (John Modell, history & philosophy, Carnegie-Mellon); Formal and legal processes (Robert Kagan, political science, Berkeley); Crime and violence (Alfred Blumstein, urban & public affairs, Carnegie-Mellon); Religion and political change (Daniel Levine, political science, Michigan); Culture and ideology (James W. Fernandez, anthropology, Princeton); Internationalization of social, economic, and political life (Peter B. Evans, sociology, Brown); International crisis management and security studies (Robert Jervis, war & peace studies, Columbia); Macroeconomic policy (Stanley Fischer, economics, MIT); Social studies of modern science and technology (Daniel J. Kevles, history of science, Cal Tech); Social knowledge producing institutions (Theda R. Skocpol, sociology & political science, Chicago); Large-scale data bases (Warren E. Miller, political science, Arizona State); Statistical analysis (John W. Pratt, business, Harvard); Measurement and scaling (A. Kimball Romney, social sciences, California-Irvine)

VOTER REGISTRATION LEGISLATION INTRODUCED IN HOUSE

On March 21, Rep. Mel Levine (D-CA) introduced a bill in the House which would allow people who change their residence to re-register to vote automatically when they turn in a change-of-address form to the post office.

The legislation is based on a proposal by Raymond E. Wolfinger, professor of political science at the University of California, Berkeley, to increase voter turnout by eliminating the need for people who move to re-register. Prof. Wolfinger presented his ideas at a COSSA congressional seminar on September 21, 1984. (See Update, September 28, 1984.) Rep. Levine, on reading a press release announcing the seminar, thought the idea had sufficient merit to warrant legislative action.

Although only 53% of the voting age population went to the polls in the 1980 presidential election, 87% of those who were registered voted. Prof. Wolfinger's research has shown that people who move are not significantly different from people who stay in the same place in terms of income, education, level of political interest, party affiliation, and race. Because re-registering to vote is not a high priority for people who have recently moved, many do not register in time to vote.

Levine's bill, which has the bi-partisan support of six other Members of Congress, would supply change-of-address forms with a carbonized form that the post office would forward to state election officials. Intrastate movers would be re-registered immediately; others would be mailed voter registration materials. Receipt of the carbonized form would also automatically cancel the voter's old registration, thus efficiently purging obsolete names from the voting records and reducing the opportunity for election fraud.

SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency rather than COSSA for more information.

National Institute of Justice: Solicited Research Program

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has been established as the principal federal agency for research, development, evaluation, and dissemination of research findings to improve and strengthen the criminal justice system. During the past two years, NIJ has moved toward bridging the gap between criminal justice theory and practice. Policy-oriented research with practical benefits is given a high priority as well as new and improved approaches for state and local agencies to use in preventing and reducing crime. The NIJ funds both solicited and unsolicited research and provides research fellowships. In the solicited research program for FY 1985, seven of nine announced topics (listed below) are still open for proposals.

FY 1985 Budget: Total budget for the Solicited Research Program is approximately $5.75 million.

Review Process: Peer review

Disciplines Supported: Research topics announced for FY 1985 are appropriate for study by scientists in virtually all social and behavioral science disciplines.

Contacts and Deadlines:

1. Violent Criminal Behavior
   Contact: Dr. Helen Erskine, 202/724-7631 Deadline: June 5

2. Drugs, Alcohol, and Crime
   Contact: Dr. Bernard Gropper, 202/724-7631 Deadline: May 22

3. Crime Control Theory and Policy
   Contact: Joel H. Garner, 202/724-7635 Deadline: May 15

4. Classification, Prediction, and Methodology Development
   Contact: Dr. Richard Laymon, 202/724-7635 Deadline: June 12

5. Victims of Crime
   Contact: Dr. Richard M. Titus, 202/724-7684 Deadline: April 30

6. Crime Prevention
   Contact: Dr. Richard M. Titus, 202/724-7684 Deadline: April 30

7. Court Effectiveness: Reducing Delay
   Contact: Bernard Auchter, 202/724-2962 Deadline: May 1

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

MEMBERS

American Anthropological Association
American Economic Association
American Historical Association
American Political Science Association
American Psychological Association
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association
Association of American Geographers
Association of American Law Schools
Linguistic Society of America

AFFILIATES

American Association for Public Opinion Research
American Educational Research Association
American Society of Criminology
Association for Asian Studies
Eastern Sociological Society
Economic History Association
Evaluation Network
Evaluation Research Society
History of Science Society
International Studies Association
Law and Society Association
Midwest Sociological Society
National Council on Family Relations
National Council for the Social Studies
North Central Sociological Association
Northeastern Anthropological Association
Population Association of America
Regional Science Association
Rural Sociological Society
Social Science History Association
Society for American Archaeology
Society for the History of Technology
Society for Research in Child Development
Society for the Scientific Study of Religion
Society for Social Studies of Science
Southwestern Social Science Association
Speech Communication Association

CONTRIBUTORS

University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Santa Barbara
Carnegie-Mellon University
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
Center for International Studies, Duke University
University of Chicago
University of Colorado
Columbia University
Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research
Cornell University
Florida State University
Harvard University
University of Illinois
Indiana University
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan
University of Iowa
The Johns Hopkins University
University of Michigan
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska
New York University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Ohio State University
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
Rutgers University
Social Science Research Council
University of Southern California
Stanford University
State University of New York at Stony Brook
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Texas A & M University
Tulane University
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS
1200 SEVENTEENTH STREET, N.W., SUITE 520, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

FIRST CLASS